

Subject: INFO-HAMS Digest V89 #940
To: INFO-HAMS@WSMR-SIMTEL20.ARMY.MIL

INFO-HAMS Digest Tue, 28 Nov 89 Volume 89 : Issue 940

Today's Topics:

 Celebrity HAMS
 ECPA (was: Military aircraft callsi
 EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS VAN
FCC don't keep the info! that's pretty dumb! (was Re: How does one become an OO?)
 Holy Code Practice! (2 msgs)
 Military aircraft callsigns...Eugene Balinski
 Multiband mobile antennas
 needed circuit to read cw
 Restrictions on RECEIVING signals in England....
 Transceiver buying advice
 What's a good "FCC class B" PC/AT c

Date: 27 Nov 89 16:55:53 GMT
From: esquire!wynkoop@nyu.edu (Brett Wynkoop)
Subject: Celebrity HAMS

In article <8911180803.AA17555@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU> 702WFG@SCRVMSYS.BITNET (bill gunshannon) writes:

>
>Does anyone remeber the call signs of:
> Arthur Godfrey, Clayton Moore (The Lone Ranger)
> ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^

K4LIB....as he used to say on his morning radio show when I was a Kid "Love It Baby"

-Brett Wa3yre

Date: 28 Nov 89 10:47:05 GMT
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!mailrus!uwm.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!
phil@ucsd.edu
Subject: ECPA (was: Military aircraft callsi

> "According to our engineers, the ONLY way you could be receiving any
> cellular phone transmissions is with a radio tuned to our frequencies.
> Of course, any such monitoring is illegal, and if you keep it up, we'll
> be required to have you prosectuted. Are you aware of the "Communications
> Privacy Laws?"
>

> After assuring him that I was, I asked him what HIS qualifications were to
> make a statement like the one above. He hemmed and hawed, and talked about
> how "good our engineers are", and other such nonsense.
>
> After I told him three or four times that I did NOT have a scanner that
> was capable of receiving those frequencies, and that I would NOT "talk
> about what you heard", I just thanked him for calling me and gave up.
>
> That was a or so ago. I wonder if the "scanner police" are going to
> come knock at my door some nite?
>
> (I'm sure glad I didn't do "that" mod to my Pro-2004).

Since you put yourself out like that, I'd sure like to suggest you follow up on it. You need to get some REALLY qualified engineering opinions (call them "second opinions" to the lawyer type). There are some people here on the net who might be able to help.

As close as you are, I would not be surprised that you can get the cellular transmissions on many other frequencies as well.

Based on the way the lawyer talked, it is clear and obvious to me that the only reason they wanted the ECPA in the first place is for hassling people like you, so hassle 'em back.

Tell them if they don't send engineers out, and actually coordinate with you on checking the equipment, that you will be filing a formal written complaint with the FCC for "transmitting on unauthorized frequencies and causing intentional (for failing to try to correct after a reasonable period of time) interference to other radio services".

And last but not least, post everything on here, including names of people, companies, phone numbers, addresses, etc. Some of us might like to know what companies are screwing up.

By the way, I had plan placing an advertisement in the local newspaper that tells people something like:

Are you aware that due to FCC frequency changes, cellular (mobile) radio transmissions can be received on an ordinary TV receiver on channels 70-83 and that your children may be hearing things on "TV" that you would not want them to hear, like personal and private telephone conversations between individuals? Receiving any of these unscrambled signals is also a VIOLATION OF FEDERAL LAW.

What can you do about this? First, NEVER allow your children to freely tune the UHF dial on your TV without you being present. NEVER tune above channel 69 for ANY REASON. And also contact

your congressman and demand that they make a law that requires the FCC to either make the cellular phone scramble their signals or move to another frequency. Newer TV sets do not have channels above 69, so if you have an older TV with 70-83, destroy it as soon as possible and replace it with a new model.

Scary, isn't it. Well, I'm holding off on the idea, because it just might create TOO MANY waves :-). I know the cellular industry would not like it one bit.

--Phil Howard, KA9WGN--
<phil@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu>

Date: Mon, 27 Nov 1989 22:09 EST
From: Dave Colvin <ppddc@uwocc1.uwo.ca>
Subject: EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS VAN

I AM GATHERING INFORMATION ON THE FEASIBILITY OF ESTABLISHING A VAN FOR DISASTER AND PUBLIC SERVICE SITUATIONS.

THIS WOULD BE CO-ORDINATED BY LOCAL HAM RADIO CLUBS AND WILL HOPEFULLY GAIN THE SUPPORT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT. WE WOULD EXPECT TO INSTALL UHF, VHF, HF, PACKET, AIRCRAFT, MARINE, AND SEVERAL OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE RADIOS. THE THOUGHT OF A PORTABLE REPEATER HAS ALSO CROSSED OUR MINDS.

WE WOULD APPRECIATE ANY INFORMATION FROM ANY PERSON OR GROUP THAT HAS GONE THROUGH THIS PROCESS.

THANKS FOR YOUR HELP.

DAVE COLVIN
SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT & COMMUNICATIONS OFFICER
PHYSICAL PLANT DEPARTMENT
UNIV. WESTERN ONTARIO
SERVICES BUILDING ROOM 5
LONDON, ONT., CANADA
N6A 5B9
PACKET VE3ZDC @ VE3GYQ
EMAIL PPDDC@UWOCC1.UWO.CA

Date: 28 Nov 89 02:18:16 GMT
From: cadnetix.COM!cadnetix!rusty@uunet.uu.net (Rusty Carruth)

Subject: FCC don't keep the info! that's pretty dumb! (was Re: How does one become an 00?)

In article <8911201752.AA13416@ti.com> rlwest@flop2.csc.ti.com (Bob West) says:
(stuff about becoming an 00)

You know, I've been wondering - since the FCC does not keep the information on how long you've been licensed, how in the world can anybody check to see when you were first licensed? Remember, they change the 'process date' field ANY time you change ANYTHING on your license (including address and even including renewals!). I've already forgotten exactly when I got *my* license, and its only been a few years (4? hmmm... no, cannot be 4, I got it after I got married, so its less than 3?).

So, how can one prove when they first got licensed? (Why do I have the feeling that the answer is "They cannot" ?)

On an entirely different subject: Don't forget the un-net this weekend! C U THERE! :-)

---Join the usenet un-net, 28.410 and/or 28.390(+/-) 1600Z to 1700Z saturdays!
Rusty Carruth. Radio: N7IKQ ^^ or later :-)
DOMAIN: rusty@cadnetix.com UUCP:{uunet,boulder}!cadnetix!rusty
home: POB. 461, Lafayette CO 80026

Date: 28 Nov 89 03:15:08 GMT
From: shelby!neon!kaufman@decwrl.dec.com (Marc T. Kaufman)
Subject: Holy Code Practice!

In article <128395@sun.Eng.Sun.COM> sxn%ingersoll@Sun.COM (Stephen X. Nahm) writes:

-While tuning the dial this evening I heard W6AD0 sending "code
-practice" at 7.1 MHz (about 6:30 pm PST Sunday). Here's
-a bit of the content:

> "Fix our thoughts on Jesus, the apostle and high...

-Kind of odd text for code practice, eh? (Unless W6AD0 is actually
-engaged in proselytizing.) Anyone know how long this has been
-going on?

A couple of years, anyway. Don't knock it. It's on almost continuously, and there is a certain... incentive shall we say... to get your code speed up so you don't have to listen to it any more. I got my speed up to Extra level by

listening to this station. I read the frequency as 7.099.

Marc Kaufman (kaufman@Neon.stanford.edu)

Date: 27 Nov 89 22:24:58 GMT
From: amdcad!positron!brian@uchvax.Berkeley.EDU (Brian McMinn)
Subject: Holy Code Practice!

sxn%ingersoll@Sun.COM (Stephen X. Nahm) writes:
> Kind of odd text for code practice, eh? (Unless W6ADO is actually
> engaged in proselytizing.)

Not really, here's why:

I just learned code and passed the Tech test. (And oh, how slow the FCC seems to be moving!)

While on the way to the local library to look for a copy of QST to check my code copy against, I tried to think of more available sources for code practice material. This is what I came up with:

- 1) The Bible (version, book, chapter and verse needed)
-- many have no copyright, most others don't care
- 2) Any major newspaper (The Wall Street Journal and the New York Times come to mind) -- stock reports could be used for letter/number practice, copyrights are a real problem
- 3) A well known cook book (Better Homes & Gardens, Betty Crocker, Joy of Cooking) -- at least one can be found in most homes, but versions aren't standard.
- 4) Telephone books (only useful for a limited geographical area) -- copyright only applies to the format, the data is free
- 5) Any major catalog (Sears, Wards, etc.) -- probably too commercial in nature

Of these four (and I'd like to see additions to this list) only the Bible is widely distributed, standardized, and free of copyright hassles. My next choice for distribution and availability would be last week's Wall Street Journal. QST is probably a good choice for W1AW because it eliminates any copyright problems and it can be found in many libraries.

If the quoted material was in fact from the Bible (I didn't recognize it), then it would be quite useful as code practice. If not, then it isn't code practice at all since it is not verifiable!

Brian McMinn brian@neptune.amd.com N5Q??

Date: 27 Nov 89 18:58:44 GMT
From: att!tsdiag!ocpt!ccop1!wilson@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU (<att!tsdiag!ocpt!ccop1!wilson@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU>)
Subject: Military aircraft callsigns...Eugene Balinski

As a SWL, former USAF Officer, Ham & USAF MARS operator, I support the right of anyone to listen to anything that is transmitted over the public airwaves, whether encrypted or not, provided they are not doing so for gain. This was the concept of the Communications Act prior to its corruption by the ECPA. The ECPA came into being only to allay fears of the cellular telephone lobby that fear of monitoring would cut into their profits.

Incidentally, there is no such thing as a "secure" radio link. One of the principles of electronic security is that encryption merely DELAYS the time that the enemy will receive information from your transmission, hopefully till after the information is already known to him by the bombs falling on his position! Any device made by man can be broken by man given enough time and money. Encryption in the military costs the enemy time; encryption in the civilian community costs the snooper money.

Finally, don't overlook the value of signal intelligence (SIGINT) even if the signals are encrypted. Just the presence, absence or change in volume or routings of encrypted messages is valuable information.

73

Gary Wilson WB2B00@KB1BD-4 AFB1WA@AFA1NC-4

wilson@ocpt.ccur.com

Date: 28 Nov 89 05:31:50 GMT
From: cs.utexas.edu!samsung!brutus.cs.uiuc.edu!jarthur!uci-ics!turner@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (Clark Turner)
Subject: Multiband mobile antennas

In article <30500303@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu> phil@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu writes:
>

>> I have recently purchased a used Yaesu FT-727R handheld, which operates

>> on both 2m and 70cm. I am quite happy with it, but I have a question
>> about how best to 'antenna' it.
>
>Larsen makes a dual band mobile antenna for several of the mounts they
>support. I just ordered the model NMO-2/70 ("motorola compatible mount")
>and an NMO-MM magmount base. I can let you know how well it works.
>.....
>
>--Phil Howard, KA9WGN--
><phil@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu>

Yep, the Larsen dual band mobile antenna is a decent choice if you want to purchase such a thing. I have the Yaesu FT470 dual band and I use the Larsen with a mag mount on the auto and it works like a charm...cost around \$70.00 though. I believe it is 1/2 wave on 2 meters and 5/8 for 70 cm. If you live in a marginal reception area, a 5/8 wave antenna for 2 meters does outperform the dual bander there (in such a case you can purchase a duplexer and install separate antennas - probably the 'best' but least flexible choice.) Then again, with a duplexer and a J-pole for each band is a reasonable solution for the roof - and the J-poles are so easy to build yourself.

Clark S. Turner
WA3JPG
turner@ics.uci.edu

"When the going gets weird,
the weird turn pro."
-Hunter Thompson

Date: 27 Nov 89 17:24:13 GMT
From: ingr!b11!herbster@uunet.uu.net (Joe Herbster)
Subject: needed circuit to read cw

In article <1704@cod.NOSC.MIL>, medin@cod.NOSC.MIL (Ted Medin) writes:
>
> Got the pc sending cw via the serial port driving the key now i need a
> circuit to read cw and toggle the serial port so the pc can read cw alos.
> Any leads appreciated.

In my experiments, i have found the following configuration to work satisfactorily;

First limiter/clipper
First bandpass filter (fairly wide)
Second limiter/clipper
Second bandpass filter (narrow centered on 800Hz)
Detector/comparator.

Another good source of circuits is issue #14 (October 1976) of BYTE magazine. They even have one that uses a PLL i have not tried. It is a fairly old issue, but someone ought to have it archived. Most of the issue deals with just this subject. Some of the info here will give a good head-start on the software end of it as well.

de km4jn

Date: 28 Nov 89 06:07:01 GMT
From: att!cbnewsd!jmseb@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU (john.m.sebeson)
Subject: Restrictions on RECEIVING signals in England....

In reading these various postings on military communications, restrictions in the UK, etc., I am reminded of several books I have read that give various peeks at the world of SIGINT (signals intelligence). Two popular ones are THE PUZZLE PALACE (about the NSA) and SPY CATCHER (about British counterintelligence by one of its one-time officers). One interesting part of the latter was the story of how the British made use of the fact that the local oscillators of radio receivers are actually little transmitters. They developed a fairly elaborate scheme for detecting what the in-country spies (usually Russians) were listening to by monitoring local oscillator signals. They used mobile vans, overflying airplanes, etc. It was apparently a great secret at the time. Both books make the point of the tremendous value of SIGINT and the cloak of secrecy that is required to protect methods and technology. Perhaps this is part of the reason for the sensitivity of the British to even unauthorized reception of radio, albeit a historical reason that may not be relevant today. Also, multiply Bob Parnass's postings on scanner frequencies by several orders of magnitude, and you get a feel for one aspect of SIGINT. Again, as I read these various postings and flames (unfortunately), I would hope that hams understand a little bit of history.

~~~~~  
John Sebeson  
KB8RY  
Naperville, IL

-----  
Date: 27 Nov 89 23:54:15 GMT  
From: hpl-opus!hpnmdla!hpmwtd!timb@hplabs.hp.com (Tim Bagwell)  
Subject: Transceiver buying advice

Mike,



I have the same interest in the rigs that you mentioned. Please post some of your more enlightening responses.

Thanks,  
de WB9MVP/6, Tim.

-----  
Date: 28 Nov 89 03:18:05 GMT  
From: shelby!neon!kaufman@decwrl.dec.com (Marc T. Kaufman)  
Subject: What's a good "FCC class B" PC/AT c

In article <30500298@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu> phil@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu writes:

>I recommend either using tightly shielded coax (meaning Belden 9913 or 9311)...

Last I saw, 9913 was low loss, but not well shielded (something like 85-90%).

For in-shack use, try RG-55 (RG-58 size) or RG-214 (RG-8 size). Both are double braid shields.

Marc Kaufman (kaufman@Neon.stanford.edu)

-----  
End of INFO-HAMS Digest V89 Issue #940  
\*\*\*\*\*